

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEVEN L. TILLEY,

Plaintiff, CIV-S-05-0228 LKK GGH PS

vs.

PETER WEISER, et al.,

Defendants. ORDER

On April 25, 2006, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within ten days. On May 2, 2006, plaintiff filed a request for reconsideration which the court construes as objections to the findings and recommendations, and they were considered by the district judge.

This court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982). As to any portion of the proposed findings of fact to which no objection has been made, the court assumes its correctness and decides the motions on the applicable law. See Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are

1 reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir.
2 1983).

3 The court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing,
4 concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the Proposed Findings and Recommendations in full.
5 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

- 6 1. The Proposed Findings and Recommendations filed April 25, 2006, are

7 ADOPTED; and

8 2. This action is dismissed with prejudice.

9 | DATED: January 25, 2007.

LAWRENCE K. KARLTON
LAWRENCE K. KARLTON
SENIOR JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT